

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/833,833	WALKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Allowed

 (1) Mathieu D. Vargot.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Mr. Parker (Atty).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 7 June 2006
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1, 10 and 42

Prior art documents discussed:


N/A

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Amendment made to claim 1 to clarify that the desired refractive index is achieved while polymeric tube is being wound on the drum; claim 10 was cancelled since the limitation therein is already set forth in claim 1; claim 42 was amended for clarity.*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SEE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)